ORIGINAL FILE

LAW OFFICES

KOTEEN & NAFTALIN

II50 CONNECTICUT AVENUE WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

TELEPHONE
(202) 467-5700
TELECOPY
(202) 467-5915
CABLE ADDRESS
"KOBURT"

BERNARD KOTEEN
ALAN Y. NAFTALIN
RAINER K. KRAUS
ARTHUR B. GOODKIND
GEORGE Y. WHEELER
HERBERT D. MILLER, JR.
MARGOT SMILEY HUMPHREY
PETER M. CONNOLLY
CHARLES R. NAFTALIN
M. ANNE SWANSON

M. ANNE SWANSON GREGORY C. STAPLE OF COUNSEL RECEIVED

June 17, 1992

UUN 17 1992

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Donna R. Searcy, Secretary Federal Communications Commission Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 92-77

Dear Ms. Searcy:

Transmitted herewith, on behalf of TDS Telecommunications Corporation, are an original and four copies of its reply comments in the above-referenced proceeding.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this matter, please communicate with this office.

Very truly yours,

Margot Smiley Humphrey

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd_ List A B C D F

ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
Billed Party Preference	;	CC Docket No. 92-77
For 0+ InterLATA Calls)	RECEIVED

REPLY COMMENTS OF TDS TELECOM

JUN 17 1992

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

TDS Telecommunications Corporation (hereinafter TDS or TDS Telecom), by its attorneys, submits these comments in response to comments elicited by the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released May 8, 1992 in the above-captioned proceeding. TDS Telecom has 86 local exchange carrier subsidiaries in 28 states.

TDS Telecom agrees with the comments of the United States
Telephone Association (USTA) and the National Telephone
Cooperative Association (NTCA) opposing the Commission's proposal
to require interexchange carriers either (a) to share billing and
validation data for their calling cards usable with 0+ access or
(b) to force their customers to dial unnecessary extra digits to
use their calling cards. The proposal should be rejected because
it would increase customer confusion and degrade customer service
solely because that might improve the competitive position of
AT&T's competitors.

TDS shares USTA's concern that customer confusion will increase if some companies decide to share validation and billing information and others do not. Moreover, TDS Telecom believes that subscribers to TDS telephone companies are not familiar with

the billing practices of Alternative Operator Service (AOS) providers. Such subscribers will not consider their interests well served by a requirement that exposes them to multiple bills and unexpected higher rates for calls they wish to have completed by AT&T or the carrier issuing the card they have chosen to use. Many rural subscribers use AT&T cards because AT&T serves all rural areas, while other carriers may not choose to serve rural communities directly. Such customers are accustomed to dialing 0+ ten digits for interexchange calls, which are then billed by the local telephone company. They have no wish to enable companies with which they have no customer relationship to appropriate their business because the owner of a hotel or the premises where a pay telephone is installed has chosen to deal with an AOS provider for the hotel or premise owner's benefit. The resulting customer confusion and unwanted billing arrangements would exact a high cost from the public in order to help AOS providers. The Commission statutory role, however, is to advance the public interest, not to equalize competition among competitors. 1

Even the questionable competitive benefit to AOS providers may not be realized. NTCA predicts (n. 4) that many or most interexchange carriers will refuse to share billing and validation data with their competitors. This prediction seems correct, particularly since customers have complained in the past

¹<u>Hawaiian Tel. Co. v. FCC</u>, 498 F. 2d 771 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

about receiving very high bills from AOS providers for calls placed with credit cards issued by other companies.

If AT&T and other interexchange carriers with 0+ cards refused to share their billing and validation data, the proposal would force cardholders to dial an unnecessary access code or telephone number. As USTA points out, in those circumstances an interexchange carrier would have to refuse attempted 0+ calls by it own cardholders on public telephones presubscribed to that carrier's service. This mandatory blocking would burden the carrier, the presubscribing customer and the cardholder making the call in exercising the precise choice that equal access is designed to ensure. Moreover, state commissions may well place customer convenience above the Commission's desire to handicap in favor of AOS providers. Further customer confusion would then result, since different dialing requirements would apply for interstate and intrastate calls. The only beneficiaries would be competing interexchange carriers, who would no longer compare unfavorably with the proprietary card issuer in terms of dialing convenience at presubscribed telephones.

NTCA correctly points out that another concern raised by the Commission's proposal to regulate AT&T's proprietary 0+ calling card terms is that it would "present an unsettling precedent further impacting the benefits of LECs' calling card operations."

NTCA explains that LEC calling cards offer important benefits to their customers.

The adverse effects of the proposal for customers are clear -- confusion and either exposure to higher rates charged by providers with whom they have not chosen to deal or needless dialing inconvenience. The potential beneficiaries are AT&T's competitors, not the public. Thus, the Commission should reject the proposal to require sharing of billing and validation information as a condition for providing convenient 0+ access for credit card calls on presubscribed telephones.

Respectfully submitted,

TDS TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

/s/ Margot Smiley Humphrey
Margot Smiley Humphrey

KOTEEN & NAFTALIN 1150 Connecticut Avenue NW Washington, DC 20036 (202) 467-5700

Its Attorneys

June 17, 1992

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Laura A. Nowak, a secretary in the law firm of Koteen & Naftalin, hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Reply Comments of TDS Telecom have been sent by First-Class United States mail, postage prepaid, this 17th day of June, 1992, to the following:

Cheryl Tritt, Chief Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street NW, #500 Washington, DC 20401

James Schlichting
Chief, Policy & Program
Planning Division
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street NW, #544
Washington, DC 20401

Gary Phillips
Policy & Program Planning
Division
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street NW, #544
Washington, DC 20401

Andrew D. Lipman Jean L. Kiddoo Ann P. Morton Swidler & Berlin, Chartered 3000 K Street NW, #300 Washington, DC 20007

Albert H. Kramer Robert F. Aldrich Keck, Mahin & Cate 1201 New York Avenue NW Penthouse Suite Washington, DC 20005 Floyd S. Keene Michael T. Mulcahy Room 4H74 2000 West Ameritech Ctr. Drive Hoffman Estates, IL 60195

Randolph J. May
Kenneth G. Starling
David A. Gross
Elizabeth C. Buckingham
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20004-2404

Francine J. Berry
Mark C. Rosenblum
Peter H. Jacoby
American Telephone & Telegraph
Company
Room 3244J1
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Danny E. Adams
Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Jane A. Fisher
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Mary J. Sisak
Donald J. Elardo
MCI Telecommunications Corp.
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20036

Gail L. Polivy Daniel L. Bart GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street NW, Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20036

David Cosson
L. Marie Guillory
Steven E. Watkins
National Telephone Cooperative
Association
2626 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037

William B. Barfield
Richard M. Sbaratta
Helen A. Shockey
South Central Bell Telephone
Company & Southern Bell
Telephone & Telegraph Co.
1155 Peachtree Street NE
Suite 1800
Atlanta, GA 30367

James P. Tuthill John W. Bogy 140 New Montgomery Street Room 1530-A San Francisco, CA 94105

W. Audie Long Kenneth F. Melley, Jr. 9311 San Pedro, Suite 300 San Antonio, Texas 78216

Greg Casey
Senior Vice President
Regulatory Affairs
Jane A. Fisher, Director
6707 Democracy Blvd.
Bethesda, MD 20817

Durward D. Dupre Richard C. Hartgrove John Paul Walters, Jr. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company 1010 Pine Street, Room 2114 St. Louis, MO Glenn B. Manishin Jeffrey Blumenfeld Blumenfeld & Cohen 1615 M Street NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

Lawrence E. Sarjeant Randall S. Coleman US West Communications, Inc. 1020 19th Street NW Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

John A. Ligon Law Office of John A. Ligon 128 Mount Hebron Avenue Upper Montclair, NJ 07043

Douglas N. Owens 4705 16th Avenue NW Seattle, Washington 98105

Larry Moreland, President c/o Caterpillar, Inc. 600 W. Washington St. AD341 East Peoria, IL 61630

Rich L. Anthony Quest Communications 6600 College Boulevard Suite 205 Overland Park, Kansas 66211

John M. Goodman 1710 H Street NW Washington, DC 20006

Linda Kent 900 19th Street NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20006-2105

Douglas F. Brent 10000 Shelbyville Road Louisville, Kentucky 40223

Mitchell F. Brecher Dow, Lohnes & Albertson 1255 23rd Street NW Washington, DC 20554 Leon M. Kestenbaum H. Richard Juhnke 1850 M Street NW 11th Floor Washington, DC 20036

/s/ Laura A. Nowak